

F 680

K 19

1876



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 604 7



permalife®
pH 8.5

E 680
.K19
Copy 1

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN A. KASSON,

OF IOWA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, August 14, 1876.



WASHINGTON.

1876.

E 650

1879



S P E E C H
O F
HON. JOHN A. KASSON.

The House having under consideration the state of the Union—

Mr. KASSON, said :

Mr. SPEAKER: If all the parliamentary inquiries of gentlemen have been answered, I will once more endeavor to proceed with what I have to say.

My honorable friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] made an elaborate speech to-day, embracing many tables, many figures, and a great deal of mathematics. He was followed by my able and honorable friend from Ohio [Mr. FOSTER] with counter-tables of correct figures and better mathematics. I do not propose to go into the mathematical questions which were debated by those two gentlemen. I will say, however, that my friend from Pennsylvania in his figures often reminded me of a remark once made in my hearing. One said that no doubt the old maxim that "two and two make four" was absolutely true. But said he, two and two also make twenty-two; and that was what he could not understand. Now it depends upon the manner in which you arrange your figures as to what they will make. I think I may say, without doing any injustice to the gentleman, that one 2 was put after the other 2, instead of under it, in many places by my honorable friend from Pennsylvania.

In the course of that gentleman's remarks he expressed his desire that ere long we might have an Executive who would be in harmony with his side of the House, and he promised great things in the way of reform should such an Executive be elected. Availing myself of the accustomed liberty of debate on a motion of this kind, I propose now, as briefly as I may, to inquire which of the two parties have offered a candidate for Chief Executive of the country who, if elected, would be most likely to gratify the people in their aspirations for an honest and loyal Government and reform.

I will first ask whether the candidate supported by my honorable friend from Pennsylvania is that Executive by whom the people may expect their honest aspirations to be realized? Who is Samuel J. Tilden, and what is his record?

"THE CANDIDATE IS THE PLATFORM."

Prior to his nomination at Saint Louis we often heard the phrase that "the candidate will be the platform." Is the democracy of this House and of the country willing to accept that maxim and apply it to their candidate?

I need not say that during the last few years, since 1860, this Government has been partially remodeled. The masses of the northern

people have become possessed of new desires and new principles; and those principles yet remain deeply ingrained in their hearts, as deeply, I trust, as they were at the time Ohio gave 100,000 majority against a colleague of Mr. Tilden in the convention at Chicago in 1861—Mr. Vallandigham, of Ohio.

What, then, has been the record of Mr. Tilden in respect to the issues which will be presented to the people of this country in the course of the pending canvass? What was his position in 1860 touching the fundamental doctrine upon which the battles for the Union were fought, the perpetual unity of the nation, for which on our side so many hundred thousands of men shed their blood or laid down their lives? Was Mr. Tilden in harmony with the Union sentiment of the country? Was he in harmony with the sentiment of the country which sustained the war? Did he urge the people to sustain the Union? Did he urge the filling of our armies? Did he censure the secession movement out of which the war grew? Is he anywhere or anyhow upon the record as the strong friend of the Union in its time of danger?

MR. TILDEN AS A SECESSIONIST.

In 1860 Mr. Tilden wrote a letter, under date of October 12, to Hon. William Kent, then a democratic elector for the State of New York, in which he said:

The masters of political science who constructed our system preserved the State governments as bulwarks for the freedom of individuals and localities against oppression from centralized power. They recognized no right of constitutional secession; but they left revolution organized when it should be demanded by the public opinion of a State; left it with power to snap the tie of confederation as a nation might break a treaty, and to repel coercion as a nation might repel invasion. They caused us to depend in a great measure upon the public opinion of the States in order to maintain a confederated Union.

Again he said:

Especially is this true of a *compact of confederation* between the States, where there can be no common arbiter invested with authorities and powers equally capable with those which courts possess between individuals for determining and enforcing a just construction and execution of the instrument.

Here, then, in 1860 we find upon the written record of Mr. Tilden a declaration that this was a confederation of States instead of a Union; that the States by their own action could "snap the tie." After that, in 1860 and 1861, the South acted upon his declaration of doctrine and proceeded to "snap the tie," supported clearly by the doctrines then enunciated by Samuel J. Tilden, whom they now seek to make President of the United States and of the restored Union. Calhoun was not stronger nor Buchanan weaker than this. It was the identical doctrine adopted by Buchanan when he denied the power to coerce the rebellious States, and left them to organize armies and batter down the walls of our forts. Nobody claimed the right to secede by the terms of the Constitution. They only claimed that the Constitution "left" them with such a right.

MR. TILDEN AS AN OPONENT OF THE WAR FOR THE UNION IN 1863.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in February, 1863, we once more hear from Mr. Tilden upon these doctrines that connect themselves with the question of the Union. There was a conference called at Delmonico's, in the city of New York, and of that conference Mr. Tilden was a member. The members of it were all known throughout the war as copperheads. In that conference in February, 1863, they organized a Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge. I myself received month after month the issues of that society, of which Mr. Tilden was one of the organizers and members. In their declarations

they took secession ground. They assailed the Government of the Union; they urged a counter-sentiment against the work going on in the war for the maintenance of the Union. They endeavored to terrify the people touching the destruction of the Constitution, which they charged against the government of Mr. Lincoln. They did everything except support the country and maintain our nationality one and indivisible. They argued constantly against the right of the Union Government to save the nation by the power of arms and discouraged the loyal people in their struggle in their darkest hours, before the sunburst of our victories at Vicksburgh and Gettysburgh.

This was the first half of 1863. I will not stop to read extracts from those articles, which showed clearly the object of the society and the influence they were designed to exert; but I will call to the minds of gentlemen that this society organized in February, 1863, and commencing immediately afterward their publications, was followed by those fearful and bloody riots in the city of New York in the succeeding month of July.

We thus far find Governor Tilden commencing as a secessionist and proceeding as an encourager of the disunionists, embarrassing the operations of the Government, and endeavoring to sow the seeds of secession broadcast in this country by means of this "Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge."

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. KASSON. On this point?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Governor Tilden was a secessionist and disunionist in 1863?

Mr. KASSON. I tell the gentleman that he wrote that secession doctrine which I have read, in a letter to Hon. William Kent in 1860. I tell him that Governor Tilden was a member of that Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge, of which the literature was all copperhead and all discouraging to the war. Is the gentleman answered?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir. Does the gentleman say that Governor Tilden was a secessionist and a disunionist in 1863?

Mr. KASSON. I say what I have said upon the record. The gentleman may consider it as exhibiting him as a disunionist or he may consider it as the highest exposition of loyal Union sentiment. I only know that in my part of the western country, and in the State of Illinois, such doctrines were met with denunciation, and men hid their heads behind the blackberry bushes when they uttered them. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman will not assert and does not assert and dare not assert that Governor Tilden was ever a secessionist or disunionist.

Mr. KASSON. I dare assert exactly what I have asserted, and let the gentleman deny it if he can.

Mr. SPRINGER. I deny it, sir; and every man will deny it who knows anything about the history of the country. [Applause on the democratic side.]

Mr. KASSON. I refer you to the record.

Mr. SPRINGER. Governor Tilden never was a secessionist or a disunionist, and the gentleman from Iowa knows it.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Where was the gentleman from Iowa during the war?

Mr. KASSON. I will tell the gentleman where I was during the war. I was on this floor passing appropriation bills to maintain the Army which fought the men you supported and with whom you are acting. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair cannot consent to the continuance of these demonstrations of applause or dissent upon the floor of the House. They are unparliamentary; and the Chair hopes they will not be repeated.

A MEMBER. They came from the galleries.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If repeated in the galleries, the galleries will be cleared. The gentleman from Iowa will proceed in order; and gentlemen upon the floor will not interrupt him without his consent.

Mr. KASSON. And at another time I was taking care of the records of this Government, which were threatened by men coming over from Virginia to take possession of the city of Washington and haul down the Union flag and trample it under their feet, as they recently did in the State of Virginia and in one or two other States of this Union on the 4th of July last. That is the work which some of us were engaged in; while others, more fortunate perhaps in obtaining honors, were gallantly fighting the enemy at the front with Rutherford B. Hayes.

MR. TILDEN IN 1864 DECLARING THE WAR A FAILURE.

Now where was Governor Tilden in 1864 when the convention met that nominated McClellan? He was at the convention at Chicago with Vallandigham, representing the State of New York upon the committee on resolutions, a member of the committee on the platform which declared this war to have been a failure. Let me give the exact words. I send them to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read the resolution then adopted and it will show where Governor Tilden was in 1864, following out the theory upon which he acted in 1860 and 1863.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That this convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that, after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired, justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, with a view to an ultimate convention of the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that, at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal States.

Mr. KASSON. Thus, Mr. Speaker, you find him uniting in reporting from the committee on the platform that resolution declaring the war a failure, assailing the government of Mr. Lincoln, denouncing the administration for the manner in which they were carrying on the war, and asking the American people to condemn it, as they are going to ask them again in November next, but with a result in the former case well known in the history of this country. The people put their foot upon the platform. They put their foot upon the men who stood upon the platform; and they will put their foot, as long as loyalty to the Union and Constitution is respected, upon the men who have not changed their faith, but still dare to come before them and ask their suffrages.

Mr. HEREFORD. Let me ask the gentleman from Iowa whether the people put their foot upon General McClellan who headed their Army?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Let me ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

Mr. KASSON. If the gentleman from New York says any fact I have stated is not correct I will yield to him.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I ask whether the gentleman from

Iowa does not know as a matter of fact that Governor Tilden as a member of that committee voted against that resolution.

Mr. KASSON. I will answer the gentleman that as far as the record goes I know the contrary. Mr. Guthrie, who was on that committee, stated, in speaking of their not being ready, that it was in the hands of a subcommittee for revision, but the general committee *were unanimous in their views*. Mr. Tilden followed Mr. Guthrie in the declaration, "I wish to add that upon the adjournment of the general committee there was no dissent among the members." That is my answer to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Governor Tilden voted against that resolution.

Mr. KASSON. Further evidence publicly given of Mr. Tilden's concurrence appears in the published reports of that convention:

Mr. Brown, of Delaware, one of the committee, said:

There is not the slightest dissension among us. We have been a unit from the first.

Mr. Weller, of California, said:

The subcommittee have agreed upon the only portion of the platform which by any possibility can divide this party. *We are all in favor of peace*, and the only difference of opinion is as to the phraseology to be used in making that declaration.

Mr. Smith, of Wisconsin, added to the general testimony upon this point, as follows:

There is no difference in the committee except upon mere matters of expression.

Mr. McKeon, of New York, explained the cause of delay as originating with Mr. Vallandigham, who wanted the language of the resolution changed, not because it was too strong, but because it was not strong enough to suit him. Finally the resolution was reported from the subcommittee to the committee, and from the committee to the convention, and was adopted without the dissent of a single member of the committee openly expressed in convention.

As to the platform adopted, there is no power unless they raise the dead, who are Guthrie and Vallandigham; no power that is able to prove the contrary of the unpatriotic record.

The further proof I cite is this: that when it was presented to the convention not a syllable of dissent was expressed by Tilden, who was a member of that committee when it came before the convention. And now shall gentlemen go into the secret operations of the committee, unknown to the public, against this evidence, and say he dissented from it in committee? Why if he loved the Union did he not rise like a man who loved his country and dared to hold a patriotic opinion, why did he not rise when it came into the convention and say, "I cannot accept that insult to the Army and to this country? The gallant soldiers at the front are fighting in the hope that the people behind them will sustain them. I will not support that clause of the platform, and I will not support the man who stands upon it." Shall I answer why he did not do it? Because of his doctrines of 1860 and 1863. Because he dared not oppose southern sympathizers. Because, as a politician, he inherits the compromising, evasive character of Martin Van Buren. I suppose 10,000 men in this country when they read his letter of acceptance said, "Martin Van Buren over again." Words to disguise thoughts, phrases to disguise principles, sentences with a double meaning, and he had not the courage to avow in the open convention the opinion, if he ever entertained it, which is attributed to him by my honorable friend from New York.

MR. TILDEN'S RECORD OF WHAT HE DID NOT DO FOR THE UNION.

Here in 1860, in 1863, and in 1864, we have the positive record of the position of Governor Tilden on these fundamental questions. The negative record is more convincing still. Where is the speech he made in the great city of New York to support the war? Where is the speech he made to encourage the soldier? Where is the speech he made to sustain the government of Mr. Lincoln in the days of its trials? Where is the speech he made to denounce the attempt of foreign governments to aid in the breaking up of this Union?

Where is the voice, I ask gentlemen on both sides of the House, and I will ask the whole country through this House, where is the voice shown by any record that that gentleman ever uttered for his country in the time of its peril? (A pause.) Nobody replies.

Mr. HOUSE rose.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. KASSON. If he rises to produce a public declaration of Governor Tilden in support of the war for the Union, I yield to him.

Mr. HOUSE. I want to ask the gentleman a question in regard to what he has just had read.

Mr. KASSON. Do you propose to give me that information?

Mr. HOUSE. I am asking the gentleman to give me some information.

Mr. KASSON. I have already given you a great deal, and I will give you more if you will be seated.

Mr. HOUSE. I only desire to say——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Iowa declines to be interrupted.

Mr. KASSON. This is his record, positive and negative, during the war for the Union which closed in 1865. I might stop here and ask any soldier in the United States whom he urged to go to the war to vote for him. I might ask the relatives of any dead soldier whom he comforted for their loss and encouraged with the hope that the sacrifice was for the preservation of the Union to vote for him. I might call upon the fund to answer for him to which he ever personally contributed for the like purposes. But, Mr. Speaker, the positive and negative evidence, considered separately or together, is ample to maintain the proposition I have made, that his principles, his heart, and his action were not with the effort to save the Union; that neither his judgment nor his heart was with the soldiers who fought for the Union, and that no man who ever wore the blue can come to the polls and cast his vote for him without reflecting upon the memory of the dead who died for that cause.

Mr. Speaker, I search this question so particularly because I maintain that deep down in the hearts of the people of the Union States, the war democrats as well as the republicans, there is a deep and affectionate regard for the men who helped them in the time of trouble and of peril; and a deep and lasting censure for the men who withheld their hand, their voice, their heart, their vote from the good cause for which they fought and for which so many perished. It is a profound and honorable instinct of patriotism, which ought to be maintained for the security of the nation in the future as well as a grateful recognition of patriotic action in the past.

MR. TILDEN AS A "REFORMER."

Now, sir, I ask what is the record of this same gentleman as a "reformer" that should lead my honorable friend from Pennsylvania to—

offer his prayer and aspiration that he might have an opportunity to work in harmony with him in another Congress? We are not without a record on this point. There have been certain political associations of that gentleman in the past and some public action which is known to the world. In 1868 he was chairman of a committee of which William M. Tweed was an active and efficient member, and at that time a circular was sent out over his signature as chairman, which is so significant upon this question of reform that I wish to secure the attention of the House for a few moments while I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows;

[Private and strictly confidential.]

ROOMS OF DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE,
October 27, 1868.

MY DEAR SIR: Please at once to communicate with some reliable person in three or four principal towns and in each city of your county, and request him (expenses duly arranged for this end) to telegraph to William M. Tweed, Tammany Hall, at the minute of closing the polls, not waiting for the count, such person's estimate of the vote.

Let the telegraph be as follows:

"This town will show a democratic gain (or loss) over last year of (number); or this one if sufficiently certain: This town will give a republican (or democratic) majority of —."

There is, of course, an important object to be attained by a simultaneous transmission at the hour of closing the polls, but not longer waiting. Opportunity can be taken of the usual half-hour lull in the telegraphic communications over lines before actual results begin to be declared, and before the Associated Press absorb the telegraph with returns and interfere with individual messages; and give orders to watch carefully the count.

Very truly, yours,

SAMUEL J. TILDEN, *Chairman.*

Mr. KASSON. "An important object is to be attained" —

Mr. CLYMER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. KASSON. For what purpose?

Mr. CLYMER. To ask him a question. Does he not know that Mr. Tilden has pronounced this circular to be without his authority? And does he not know that he has said solemnly that he had never signed it and never knew anything about it?

Mr. KASSON. I do happen to know certain facts about it which I should be as willing to state, and intended to state without a question being put to me, as with it.

Mr. CLYMER. Does the gentleman not know that that is a forgery; that Mr. Tilden never authorized it to be issued, and never saw it before it was issued?

Mr. KASSON. I understand that question distinctly, and I am glad the question has been put; for otherwise I should have volunteered to answer it. He was in association on that committee with William M. Tweed. He, this reformer, had previously received a contribution of \$5,000 from William M. Tweed, his associate on committee, for election purposes; and this circular was sent out with Mr. Tilden's signature attached, as it is alleged by Tweed, an active member of committee, and not by the chairman. This was in 1868, and in 1873, five years after, Mr. Tilden, so far as I know, is first heard from in a pamphlet, which he published, denying that it was his signature, and asserting that it was put there without his consent.

Mr. COX. I have a letter from Mr. Tilden in 1868 denying that under his own hand and seal. I ask to have it put in the RECORD along with that falsehood.

Mr. KASSON. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. COX. Of course not.

Mr. KASSON. I have learned how to appreciate all these private suggestions—

Mr. COX. I desire to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. KASSON. That does not go into my speech till I know what it is.

Mr. CLYMER. It ought to go into the gentleman's speech.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Iowa must not be interrupted except with his own permission.

Mr. COX. Of course not; I am not interrupting him.

Mr. KASSON. The course pursued by gentlemen on the other side of the House is exactly characteristic of their leader, Governor Tilden. They evade responsibility for action by disclaiming words. There was no time prior to 1873 or prior to the exposure of Tweed, so far as I know, that Governor Tilden ever came out with this disclaimer.

Mr. CLYMER. In 1868 he did it.

Mr. KASSON. That was when the governorship had been already stolen from the people of the State by this gigantic fraud which startled two continents and put the democratic governor into the gubernatorial chair of New York, to the exclusion of Griswold and as successor of Governor Dix; a fraud perpetrated at least by some of the committee of which he was chairman:

Now there is one witness whom I quote against all the private letters and all the private adherents of Mr. Tilden, because his character has been indorsed by the democrats of the whole country for the high office of the Presidency of the United States. Horace Greeley said this to Mr. Tilden on the very point we are now discussing:

You hold a most responsible and influential position in the counsels of a great party. *You could make that party content itself with polling legal votes if you only would.* In our late constitutional convention I tried to erect some fresh barriers against election frauds. Did you? The very little that I was enabled to effect in this direction I shall try to have ratified by the people at our ensuing election. Will you? Mr. Tilden, you cannot escape responsibility by saying with the guilty Macbeth:

"Thou canst not say I did it: never shake
Thy gory locks at me,"

for you were at least a passive accomplice in the giant frauds of last November.

But, says the gentleman from New York, [Mr. Cox,] Mr. Tilden in 1868 did say, "*Thou canst not say I did it,*" and shook his gory locks after the fact accomplished and the fruits realized; but Mr. Greeley warns him against that very thing, and gives this reason for it:

Your name was used, without public protest on your part, in circulars sowed broadcast over the State, whereof the manifest intent was to "make assurance double sure" that the frauds here perpetrated should not be overborne by the honest vote of the rural districts. *And you, not merely by silence, but by positive assumption, have covered those frauds with the mantle of your responsibility.*

On the principle that "the receiver is as bad as the thief," *you are as deeply implicated in them to-day as though your name was Tweed, O'Brien, or Oakey Hall.*

Mr. Greeley's real opinion of Mr. Tilden's excuses and of his relation to the fraud appears further and very plainly in this additional extract from that historical denunciation of election fraud:

On one very important point, however, your bitterness as a partisan has impelled you to ignore and come short of your duties as a citizen and a professed upholder of government by the people, and *for this dereliction I here arraign you.* I allude to the preservation of the purity of the ballot-box.

I can imagine how a man may shut his eyes to many things which he deems it convenient not to know; but I must speak of what you *must* know, *however you may wish to seek to be ignorant of it.*

Now I put the evidence of that great and honest man, for whom Mr. Tilden himself voted in the last presidential campaign, against any evidence that the gentleman from New York may produce. This was the testimony of a man upon the spot who had been nearly forty years side by side with Mr. Tilden, who knew his character and all the facts as well as any member from New York upon this floor, and he pronounced that Mr. Tilden must have known the scheme of fraud, and that he was a "passive accomplice" in the frauds; and further tells him he could have stopped them if he chose. Now is that the kind of reformer to place in the presidential chair? A man who was one of the executive officers of that committee and sat on the committee with Mr. Tilden, and signed Mr. Tilden's name, as it is claimed, to this circular without his consent; and yet Governor Tilden did not denounce it, nor reject the benefits of it, and gave no light to disclose the frauds so that the perpetrators might be punished, and the man who had been truly elected might be seated, a man who was as truly entitled to his seat as any member here is entitled to a seat on this floor.

Mr. CLYMER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KASSON. I cannot yield at this point.

Mr. CLYMER. He declines to hear the truth.

Mr. KASSON. I am repeating the truth, and that is what hurts. Whenever you touch his history prior to the disclosures in the New York Times of the Tweed ring and of their frauds, you touch that organization of which Mr. Tilden was an active member on the executive committee or as a member of the Tammany ring. Such is his history as a "reformer" in respect to the purity of elections.

MR. TILDEN IN CONNECTION WITH RAILROADS.

But that is not all. Sir, we have some further evidence touching his qualities as a "reformer." We have had many railroad questions before this House. We have investigated them, and we have been endeavoring to settle them on a principle that would protect the people and the Government of the United States.

It will be claimed that if Mr. Tilden is elected he will reform the legislation of the country in respect to the railroad system. I am frank to admit that he has considerable knowledge of the disposition to be made of a bankrupt railroad, and a knowledge of the manipulation of railroads, which gives him a practical idea as to the things to be amended and reformed. But that history is such a one as will not give the people of the country confidence in his disposition to reform them in the public interest. Among various railroad corporations investigated in this House was one which was called the Credit Mobilier a corporation connected with the railroad which was charged with having defrauded the Government of the United States by improper contracts made with themselves under the name of the Credit Mobilier and with plundering the Government of the United States of many millions of money. We took evidence in that investigation before a committee of the House. I give the following questions and answers from the record of this House in the examination of Mr. Oakes Ames:

Mr. HOAR. Were you not informed by the counsel who drew the contract that this was a violation of law?

Mr. AMES. We were informed by counsel whom we consulted that this issuing of stock (to the C. M.) as a payment upon the contract for building the road was in entire compliance with the law.

Question. Who were the counsel that gave you that advice?

Answer. Mr. SAMUEL J. TILDEN, Mr. Charles Tracy, and Judge Allen..

Q. All of New York?

A. All of New York.

Again, Mr. John B. Alley put upon the stand and examined. I quote from his testimony:

Question. And further, I understood you to say that you were instructed by eminent counsel, upon whose advice you relied, that the course you took was a compliance with the law?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever seen, or do you know whether that opinion of eminent counsel is in existence now in writing?

A. I do not know. I do not know whether it was given in writing.

Q. Was it given to you by these eminent counsel?

A. Mr. TILDEN, *I know*, told me that he regarded it as a compliance with the law.

There, sir, you have a record of this House proving that this "reformer" was one of the counsel who advised the very thing that has shocked the whole country with the enormities of the wrong and the extent of the robbery involved in it. What would you not have said of him had he been the republican candidate for the Presidency? How you would have investigated him, what committee reports you would have supplied, and what inquiries into his stocks and bonds and bank account! And yet we are asked to believe, the country is asked to believe, that Mr. Tilden is to purify this Government and to restore it to the purity of our fathers.

It is not necessary for me to proceed much further in this direction, for the simple reason that Mr. Tilden is so well known, particularly to the people of the West, if not to the people of the whole country, in his relation to railroads, that I need not further detail the evidence. Mr. Tilden has spent nearly his whole life in the city of New York; he has made nearly all his fortune in stock operations centered in that city and in connection with railroads. I do not allude to the question of his fortune, said to be so very large, except as it is involved in this exhibition of his relation to railroads, of which the journals of the country have been full, and which has an interest for the public in view of possible legislation touching railroads and their subsidies of land and money.

This, however, I will say, that the farmers of the West, the people of our villages, the people who believe in the characteristic disregard of the people's interest by the speculative rings of Wall street, will not accept for their candidate for the high office of President a man whose education upon these subjects has been almost exclusively received in Wall street, and who has had no relation with the interests of the great masses of the people of this country and no sympathy with them.

TAKING HONORS WHICH BELONG TO GOVERNOR DIX.

One word upon his relation to the State government of New York as exhibited by himself. He claims to be a reformer in another respect, which I think is inconsistent with his honor as a public officer. Governor Dix, during his term of office, found that the sinking fund of the State of New York had been depleted by his democratic predecessors to the extent of many millions of dollars in order to save themselves from the responsibility of taxing the people for their extravagant expenditure. Governor Dix replaced that entire sinking fund and paid off a large amount of public debt, as the fruit of the taxation and economies practiced during his term of office. Governor Tilden has since made a speech in regard to the reduction of the public debt of that State and of the taxes—a reduction which his republican predecessor had brought about by the purity, economy,

and high honor of his administration—and has claimed himself the credit for what had been secured by that noble statesman and soldier of two wars, Governor John A. Dix. In this respect I charge Governor Tilden with having stolen the honors that belonged to Governor Dix and with having shown that, instead of being a reformer himself, he claims the honors which belong to the reforms of his predecessor, the fruits of which he enjoyed in his official capacity as governor of the State of New York. His own official claim to reform rests upon his movement against the canal ring, in which, however, he has stopped with the conviction of a single offender.

THE RESULT OF THIS INVESTIGATION.

I have now shown Mr. Tilden's relation to the doctrines of secession, his committal to the theory of disunion, his abstinence and silence in the time of his country's peril, his failure to put on record any word or act of cheer to our army, and his presence and association with Vallandigham and others of like stamp in the anti-war convention of 1864. I have also shown the unsoundness of his claims as a representative reformer, because of his relations to the election frauds of 1863, his silence after their discovery, and his failure to condemn them or the perpetrators of them when called upon to do so by Greeley; because of his association with Tweed until others had exposed and denounced him; because of his willful appropriation to himself of the reform honors of Governor Dix; and because of his failure to carry on the war against the canal ring from the moment it appeared likely to injure his anticipated nomination for the Presidency by the help of New York.

Does this candidate represent the aspirations of the Union-loving and reform-loving people of the United States?

RUTHERFORD B. HAYES, THE REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLICAN.

Whom have the republicans presented to oppose him? Not a lawyer from the speculative ranks of Wall street. Not a man bred in the views of public life which pertain to the peculiar associations of a great money center where speculation supersedes productive industry. But they present a man born in the country, in a comparatively new State, and raised in the country, in the midst of its simple life and toil; a man who from his maturity devoted himself to the hard work of his profession until higher and more dangerous duties called him away; a man of education, a man who has established a reputation for honesty in professional life and in public life perfectly irreproachable, unassailed as well as unassailable; a man whose record on the questions of secession and of disunion is shown by the offer of his life to his country, by the marks of the wounds that still leave their traces upon his body; shown by manuscript written with his patriotic blood and proved by every word that he has uttered since the outbreak of the war.

The candidate for whom we ask the votes of the men who fought for the Union is a comrade of theirs. He is the man who, when lying upon the ground at South Mountain with broken arm and wounds bleeding, arose in his pain and rushed forward to save his command from the peril into which he conceived they were going. He is the man who has dismounted from his horse to allow the weary-foot soldier to ride him. He is the man who while in the field was offered an office at the rear, and replied by a laconic letter worthy of the noblest Spartan whoever fought in phalanx—a letter dated in camp, in which he took time to say between battles, "Any man who would leave the Army at this time to electioneer for Congress ought to be *scalped*," and signed and sent it.

No man doubts his position in respect to the war; no man doubts his courage, his discretion, his devotion to his country. No widow mourning for the loss of her husband can hesitate to ask her son to vote for the man who fought on the same field, for the same cause, and endured the same deprivations and dangers. No orphan now grown up and old enough to cast his vote for the Union his father helped to save, can hesitate as to the man he should vote for to secure the great rights preserved by the war and the perpetuity of the Union.

And, sir, he is equally acceptable to the country in its aspirations for reform. I have known him and served with him on this floor. Show me, if you can, where ever a corrupt thing was done by him or encouraged by him. Show me his advice to a Credit Mobilier job at the expense of the Government. Show me the William M. Tweed of whom he ever solicited \$5,000 for a corrupt election fund. Show me the William M. Tweed with whom he ever associated on a campaign committee. Show me the Vallandigham with whom he ever sat in council to draw up the platform of principles upon which a political campaign was to be fought and a nation saved. Show me the man, enemy of his country or corruptionist in his country, with whom Rutherford B. Hayes was ever an intimate associate!

THE VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.

And if you look at those associated with these candidates on the same ticket, you will see how inconsistent the nominee of the democratic party is with the platform which they have adopted. For instance, they denounce the republican party for granting the public lands to aid in the building of railroads, a "waste" they call it of the public domain and demand reform in it, and then they nominate Mr. Hendricks as their candidate for Vice-President, who turns around and accepts the situation confidently. Our own republican convention had already denounced the system, and had put a stop to it by legislation in the interest of actual settlers. Yet when Mr. Hendricks was a Senator of the United States he rose in his place in 1864 to advocate the land grant (one of the most enormous ever made, I think 37,000,000 acres) for the Northern Pacific Railroad. He said:

The bill before the Senate proposes to encourage the construction of a very important railroad to connect the waters of Lake Superior with the waters of the Pacific Ocean. Everybody can see at a glance that it is a work of national importance. It proposes to grant lands in a northern latitude, where without the construction of a work like that the lands are comparatively without value to the Government. No person acquainted with the condition of that section of the country supposes that there can be very extensive settlements until the Government shall encourage those settlements by the construction of some work like this. I do not think that a work of such national importance ought to be embarrassed in its passage through this body and through the House of Representatives by amendments proposing works that are comparatively local.

Again, in 1868, he said:

Now, sir, this is a great work. It can be accomplished with the aid of the land grant; it is one of the greatest achievements this country has ever contemplated. * * * But all that is proposed to this road is to give it lands that are to-day not worth one cent per acre to the Government. There is not a Senator here who would give for that vast region of country, unaided by some work of this sort, one cent per acre. Senators forget what it is that gives value to the public lands.

Again, in respect to the Hannibal and Saint Joseph Railroad grant he said in debate:

It was constructed in part by the Government of the United States. As a member of the House of Representatives, a number of years ago, I felt it to be my duty to vote in favor of a land grant to enable the State of Missouri to build that very important road.

I also refer to the Senate debates of 1864 for his liberality in land grants, and especially to the Bayfield and Saint Croix Railroad.

If you look to the democratic candidate for the Vice-Presidency in reference to his loyalty to the Union and his relations to secession, you find him in 1864, after his election to the Senate, making a speech at Seymour, in Indiana, in which he so mildly spoke of the errors of the soldiers who deserted that he was cheered by the men around him who had sheltered the deserters in their midst, and spoke so severely of the men who should come to arrest them and take them back to the Army that the whole audience burst out into a roar of applause.

That meeting was called by a remarkable paper, which probably most of you have seen, which invited "all who favored peace, who desired to be free from the death-grip of this infamously wicked, imbecile, and tyrannical administration, its arbitrary and illegal arrests, its drafts and conscription laws, by which peaceful citizens are dragged from their homes and all the endearments of domestic life to butcher and be butchered"—inviting all these to "come out and hear this advocate of peace and reunion;" and that advocacy was made in the manner I have stated.

So, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the constitutional amendments which the nation secured at such cost and holds so dear, he always voted in the negative. We are asked to elect to administer the Constitution, as amended, the very man who voted against and opposed every one of those amendments and who is still bitterly hostile to them in principle.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. Has the gentleman before him the speech of Governor Hendricks to which he has referred?

Mr. KASSON. Yes, sir, I have that speech; not at full length, but very interesting parts, in which in a manner not precisely peaceful he recommended that the men who came to arrest deserters should meet an unwelcome reception. I cannot stop to read it. I will refer the gentleman to almost any of the newspapers, particularly the Chicago Tribune and other papers in which I have seen it.

This is the record of Governor Hendricks in respect to these questions.

On the other hand, we have nominated for Vice-President WILLIAM A. WHEELER, of New York, a man with whom many of us have stood here for years side by side; against whom a corrupt thing was never charged, to whom a disloyal sentiment was never attributed; a man above reproach and fearless for the right, and who has been one of the most admirable presiding officers we have ever had in the chair, either permanently or temporarily.

I have spoken of the candidates particularly and their records, because I earnestly believe that there is great import in the declaration which we heard before the nominations, that this year the candidate would be the platform.

Mr. CLYMER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. How does Mr. WHEELER's record in reference to railroad grants compare with that of Mr. Hendricks?

Mr. KASSON. I have not examined it, and remember no speech of his about it. I think that in some cases he may have voted for grants; but generally Mr. WHEELER was more prudent and careful than Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. CLYMER. Mr. WHEELER voted for everything of that kind. Mr. KASSON. I have no doubt that in the old times, before the evil of this system had developed, Mr. WHEELER, like Douglas, may have voted for some of the land grants. But we have not done as the democrats have; we have not denounced the men who formerly

voted for land grants and then nominated one of them on that platform.

Mr. CLYMER. You are for them all the time.

Mr. KASSON. The gentleman knows that I am not.

Mr. CLYMER. I mean your party.

Mr. KASSON. Our party has long since declared against them, as the gentleman and every one else knows, and the grants are stopped.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the candidates are the platform, for which of these should the votes of Union men and reformers be cast?

Mr. SPRINGER. For Tilden and Hendricks.

Mr. KASSON. I think a weak voice said, "For Tilden and Hendricks;" a weak voice, and but a single voice. The question is to be put to the country; and there we are perfectly content to leave it.

Mr. SPRINGER. So are we.

Mr. KASSON. The time has not come when the people of the United States have forgotten the experience of the last fifteen years and the fruits of the war, which even the southern gentlemen on this floor say they do not desire to disturb. We have not forgotten the records of public men during that war; and until the waters of Lethe flow over our minds we shall not forget to sustain the men who have been true to their country and oppose the men who in the time of peril have faltered or gone back from their duty to their country.

When these questions of fidelity to cause and country are put to the people you may attempt to rally them under party cries; you may sound the bugle-call and promise the rewards of office; but gentlemen must not forget that there is deep down in the hearts of the North and of the patriotic men of the border States a feeling that they must intrust the Constitution as it now exists and the Union as now restored to the men who have maintained it and stood by it from the beginning to the end.

THE SOUTHERN QUESTION.

I should perhaps neglect my duty if, for a single moment, I did not speak of another political difference. I have taken no part hitherto in the debates upon the so-called southern question. Let me, before I sit down, say a few frank words to the democrats of the Southern States.

We are not, as they charge, desirous to control the Southern States in their domestic affairs. We are not desirous to have incompetent or dishonest men elected to office because they call themselves republicans. If, when you speak of "carpet-baggers," you speak of men who have no interest in the South, who own no land there, who were not born there and have gone there not to exercise any lawful calling or profession, but to speculate upon office, we condemn them as heartily as you condemn them. We have every possible desire to see the men who really have a stake in the country, who have interests there, who belong there, and who are heartily for the Union, take the control of the southern State governments, if they have not already done so.

We wish as a nation, if possible, to have nothing to do with them outside of their Federal relations; and only one thing has led even to the moral interference which is heard from this side upon the floor of this House. That is, that you give us no assurance of repose in respect to your observance of the constitutional amendments. The National Government has taken its hands off as far as practicable. We desire to leave elections free and to leave you exempt from interference on this floor, or by the Executive; but then comes up to us

suddenly a great cry from the neighbors and families of murdered black or murdered white republicans, shocking the entire sentiment of the North once more, until we are led to believe you do not intend to observe in good faith the constitutional amendments and rights of citizens.

Here is precisely our trouble. We have the power to enforce those amendments by the Constitution itself. We wish not to have it to do, but you will not enforce them yourselves. You say these outbreaks and massacres are simply the demonstrations of the bad portion of your population. That may be true, but what troubles us is that while the bad organize to commit wrongs and outrages the good have no counter-organization to protect victims against wrong. They accept its fruits. Your society as a society does not organize to suppress them; you do not bring the perpetrators to punishment; you do not bring your moral influence at home to suppress them. All these things lead us to believe it is not yet safe to intrust your candidate with the administration of the amendments to the Constitution or with the protection of the liberties and the rights of citizens under them. Mr. Speaker, it is certain that these violations of life, of liberty, and of right have been frequent, that these crimes are perpetually repeated; and I say in all candor that the only cause why we insist upon the whole power of legislation under those amendments and demand an Executive who believes in them is because the occasion for enforcing them is perpetually presented to us.

I know the northern people feel that the greatest boon which can be given to them in this relation, the greatest demand we present on this side of the House, is simply that every man who by the Constitution is secured in his rights and is authorized to vote shall be permitted to speak, to work, and to vote without intimidation and without doing it at the peril of his life. When that day shall come we have done with all protective interference in elections in the Southern States and the Union will be really restored.

The North looks with hope to the old whig element in the South, which did not originally advocate secession doctrines or accept the resolutions of '98, to return to its prominence in political affairs as an organization for the maintenance of the Constitution and the Union, and with a following of all voters who ask their constitutional rights only. I venture further to say that when that old Union-loving element shall declare itself the protector of the rights of all men, white and black, under the amended Constitution, it will be recognized in its relations to the Federal Government as fully as it ever was before the war; for that is all that republicanism demands. It is to secure such results and the restoration of an era of good feeling that we earnestly advocate the election of Governor Hayes.

Here, then, without detaining the House longer, are the views which I present at this late period of the session in reply to the expressed hope of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the election of his candidate for President of the United States. I do not share his aspirations. I do not recognize them as justified either by the condition of the country or by the interests of the Union, of the Constitution, or of reform, nor by the record his candidate has made.

NOTE.—Mr. HEWITT, of New York, having inserted in the RECORD, as a note to his speech, an article never read nor alluded to in the debate, nor shown to me, although supposed to contradict my statements, it only remains to me to speak of it in a like note.

The certificate of Mr. Marble, like the certificate of Mr. HEWITT, to Mr. Tilden's loyalty, is simply the partisan's declaration of his private recollections, and both



0 013 789 604 7

involve the color of their own opinions as to what constituted Unionism in 1860 and 1864. As I understand Mr. Marble's only quotation from Mr. Tilden's language—all the rest being a general affirmation of political good character, without production of evidence furnished by Mr. Tilden—this only quotation is made from a "manuscript" which I do not understand Mr. Marble to certify was ever published over Mr. Tilden's signature.

So far as this certificate is concerned it would only prove a facing two ways by Mr. Tilden. Certain it is that he wrote the public letter to Mr. Kent which I read from, and which is a secession letter in its doctrines; certain it is that he belonged to that copperhead society for the diffusion of political knowledge in 1863; certain it is that he was a member of the anti-war convention at Chicago which nominated McClellan, and that he served with Vallandigham on the platform committee; certain it is that he did *not* oppose nor dissent from the peace resolution openly in the convention, where he ought to have done it. These things are certain, and are not denied by Mr. Marble nor by Mr. HEWITT; certain it is that Mr. Tilden did not publicly repudiate the election frauds of 1868 perpetrated under color of his name, nor make a single effort to punish the criminals who were on the same committee with him for their alleged forgery of his name and their consequent frauds.

These things I charged, and these things Mr. Marble does not deny. Now when I make charges resting on a public record in part, like the Kent letter, and the organization of the copperhead society in February, 1863, and in part on the want of a good public record for the Union, it is no sufficient answer to tell me of individual instances resting in private knowledge, and which made no record committing Mr. Tilden openly and publicly to the support of the Union cause and Government. He may have attended meetings, but also have carefully kept his name from papers and speeches committing himself to our cause. He may have sent private messages of advice, but carefully kept them from public knowledge till the Union cause had won. It was the public record I demanded, and Mr. HEWITT now alleges private knowledge of individuals, revived as twelve-year-old recollections from the willing memories of his partisans. It utterly fails to meet the issue presented by me.

○

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 604 7



permalife®
pH 8.5